

### **REMARKS**

This is in full and timely response to the Official Action of September 29, 2006. A petition to extend the time for this response to within the first extended month accompanies this submission. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

#### **Priority Acknowledgement**

The acknowledgment that the certified copies in support of the priority claim have been received is appreciated.

#### **Specification**

Notwithstanding a submission of a substitute specification in this application on February 1, 2005, that substitute version has been further amended upon completion of a review for preparation of this response. Entry is thus solicited. It is noted that the drawings filed on September 29, 2004 are accepted.

#### **Information Disclosure Statement**

The Applicant, through its representatives and attorneys, hereby submits copies of the Japanese publications, together with their English language Abstracts, as cited at page 2 of the specification. Since this submission is after the first action on the merits and responsive to the examiner's point in section 1 on page 2 of the Action, and their relevance there indicated, a fee of \$180 should be charged to the Deposit Account of the undersigned. It is further understood that an IDS can be incorporated into a response, so that a "separate paper" relative to this amendment is not required. A Form PTO/SB/08 accompanies this submission.

Consideration and entry of those documents into the record is appropriate and requested.

Rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §101

Original Claim 11 had referred to a program that causes a computer to execute a display process...comprising certain steps. Thus, it was not seen why the section 101 rejection was made, except perhaps for failing to include a "machine readable program". Nevertheless, in view of the restructuring of the pending claims, the substantive portion of claim 11 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and a new claim 18 submitted. That new claim calls for a recording medium for recording a "computer-readable program to be executed by a computer to carry out processing" with positively stated steps in the process of the program. This is believed to be an appropriate claim form for a program.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection insofar as it may have been perceived to continue to be applicable to new claim 18.

Original claims 1 to 11

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10 and 11 were initially rejected as anticipated by the U.S. Patent to Sekiguchi, No. 6,710,789 for the reasons stated in section 4 of the Action at pages 3 to 6. Claim 3 was initially rejected as obvious over Sekiguchi in view of the publication to Chen, Pub. No. 2002/0169893 for the reasons stated in section 6 of the Action at pages 6 and 7. Claim 4 was rejected as obvious over Sekiguchi in view of Klein, No. 6,064,303 for the reasons stated in section 7 on pages 7 and 8 of the Action. Claim 5 was initially rejected as obvious over Sekiguchi in view of Mizutome, No. 6,943,845 for the reasons stated in section 8 of the Action at pages 8 and 9. Claim 6 was rejected as obvious over Sekiguchi in view of Maissei, No. 6,637,029 for the reasons stated in section 9 of the Action at pages 9 and 10. Claim 7 was rejected as obvious over Sekiguchi in view of Stevenson, Pub. No. 2005/0036036 for the reasons stated in section 10 of the Action at pages 10 and 11. Claim 9 was rejected as obvious over Sekiguchi in view of Mahoney et al as set for the in section 11 on pages 11 and 12 of the Action. Additional references were cited, made of record, but not relied upon as noted on page 12 of the Action.

All of these rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the restructuring of claims 1 to 11 as claims 1 to 18. For the convenience of the examiner, a clean copy of claims 1 to 18 is provided as an appendix to this submission. As to the combination rejections, it is noted that the statements of motivation or suggestion to combine are not alleged to flow from the teachings of the references without review of the Applicant's original claims as a template for the combinations.

#### Background of the Invention

The claimed invention, according to the amended and new claims, finds support in the specification as filed, so that the original Background at pages 1 and 2 is instructive. There, the problem is structured relative to the prior art cited at page 2 in which Patent Document 1 has a technology in which a user can set the content and the display position on a matrix of each of a plurality of windows, and Patent Document 2 discloses a technology in which a user can customize the display representing the position where an event occurs without altering the application. Neither of those documents detects an event correspond to predetermined display information which has already been displayed, as in amended claim 1 and new method claims 17 and 18.

#### The Applicant's Invention as Claimed in the Amended and New Claims

Thus, an important and significant feature of the Applicant's invention is detecting an event corresponding to predetermined display information which has already been displayed, and then presenting the occurrence of the event to the user. The specification is replete with examples of what is the meaning of "detecting an event" and presenting the occurrence of the event to the user means as illustrated, for example, at Fig. 5 (conveniently showing priorities from among the various display categories), altering location, area and font size (Fig. 6) and in Figs. 8, 10 and 18, among others. See the specification for still other examples as claimed.

Claim 1, as amended, is repeated for the convenience of the examiner as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A display device that is capable of displaying predetermined display information in each of a plurality of display areas, the display device comprising:

a display unit configured to display said display information;

a setting unit configured to [for setting] set display control information that represents the relationship between [position and size of] the display area and the [switching of] the display information [for when a predetermined event is detected, based on user inputs]; and

a display control unit configured to control [for controlling one] said display unit to display [including the plurality of display areas such that] the display information [is] so as to be displayed in each of the plurality of display areas, based on the display control information set by the setting unit,

wherein, when the display control unit detects an event corresponding to a predetermined display information displayed in a predetermined area, [upon detection of the event,] the display control unit [switches the position or size of the display area where the display information for the detected event is displayed based on the display control information] controls said display unit to present the occurrence of the event to the user.

As seen, claims 1 calls for a combination of a display unit configured to display predetermined display information in each of a plurality of display areas, a setting unit configured to set display control information that represents the relationship between the display area and the display information, and a display control unit configured to control the display unit to display the display information to be displayed in each of the plurality of display areas, based on the display control information set by the setting unit. Uniquely, the Applicant's system for that claimed combination calls for an expressed feature "where, when the display control unit detects an event corresponding to a predetermined display information displayed in a predetermined area, the display control unit controls the display unit to present the occurrence of the event to the user".

This device is supported, for example, by the embodiment shown in Fig. 1, with the control logic of Figs. 3 and 4, where the logic for controlling the display is referred to in the logic

diagram of Fig. 7 to achieve, for example, the event conditions as seen in Figs. 10 and 11 to 14, inclusive.

In contrast, Sekiguchi does not teach “detecting an event” and “presenting occurrence of the event to the user” as set for in amended claim 1, or in new independent method claim 17 and program claim 18. The notion of “events” is referred to the Applicant’s specification, such as discussed in the penultimate paragraph of page 12, discussing sound of a TV program as a trigger for display switching responding to an “event”. “Display control information” is discussed at page 14 in the last full paragraph, while switching displays according to detection of an event is discussed in the paragraph spanning pages 15 and 16.

Rather, Sekiguchi merely discloses judging whether or not to provide an authorization to acquire the one of the pre-defined display areas, when receiving a request from one of the processing units for acquiring one of the predefined display areas. Thus, because Sekiguchi is deficient in teaching, hinting or suggesting a main feature of the amended and new claims, the claim package of claims 1 to 18 is patentable over the art applied.

### Conclusion

Claims 1 to 18 as presently pending are submitted to be patentable over the art of record, either taken alone or in any proper, motivated combination. In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorney for Applicant